

Political Science



PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

SUPPORTERS AND OPPONENTS
SOVIET PEACE PROGRAMME

VICTOR SAPRYKOV

VICTOR SAPRYKOV **PEACEFUL
COEXISTENCE**

—SUPPORTERS AND OPPONENTS
—SOVIET PEACE PROGRAMME

Novosti Press Agency
Publishing House
Moscow, 1979

"The USSR steadfastly pursues a Leninist policy of peace and stands for strengthening of the security of nations and broad international co-operation.

"The foreign policy of the USSR is aimed at ensuring international conditions favourable for building communism in the USSR, safeguarding the state interests of the Soviet Union, consolidating the positions of world socialism, supporting the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress, preventing wars of aggression, achieving universal and complete disarmament, and consistently implementing the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

"In the USSR war propaganda is banned."

Article 28 of the Constitution
(Fundamental Law) of the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics

C-88 513

0302030105
11102

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House,
1979

Editing completed on February 14, 1979

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	5
WHO CHAMPIONS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND WHO OPPOSES IT?	6
IN THE INTERESTS OF MANKIND	19
THE PEACE PROGRAMME	23
"SOCIALISM AND PEACE ARE INDISSOLUBLE"	33
DETENTE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS	38
THE BATTLE OF IDEAS	44
AFTERWORD	50

FOREWORD

For several years now relaxation of international tension has been the dominant trend in the course of world affairs.

Yet, throughout these years a sharp political and ideological struggle has continued over the problems of detente and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. It is a struggle between those who favour a constructive refashioning of the system of international relations and those who oppose this. In this struggle each side is upholding quite definite—and divergent—class and political interests. These are not the interests of individual statesmen or political parties. They have a most direct bearing on the destinies of all countries and peoples, and on the destiny of every human being. That is why it is important to see clearly who benefits from peaceful coexistence and who benefits from the arms race. That is the question which the author of this booklet has endeavoured to answer.

WHO CHAMPIONS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND WHO OPPOSES IT!

The issue of peaceful coexistence arose historically with the birth of Soviet Russia, the world's first state of working people. For it is precisely since the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, whose 60th anniversary was celebrated in 1977, that states with opposing social systems—capitalist and socialist—have existed on our planet side by side. The 1917 Russian Revolution heralded a new era in the development of society, the era of transition from capitalism to socialism, of struggle "to liberate nations from imperialism, to put an end to wars among nations, to overthrow capital and to win socialism".¹

At its very inception the Soviet state called for the establishment of a just and democratic peace among nations and offered such a peace to the peoples in the Decree on Peace, its first legislative act, which was drafted by Vladimir Lenin, the organizer and leader of the first socialist state.

A just and democratic peace has nothing in common with an onerous peace established as a result of the strong dictating to the weak, of the seizure of territory and the subjugation of conquered nations. The peace for which Lenin strove is based on

¹ Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 28, p. 167.

a renunciation of the use of force against other peoples, on a recognition of the right of every people to choose freely and without any outside interference their own path of development and order of society. It is based on respect for the territorial sovereignty and integrity of all countries.

Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence posed the task of striving to ensure that the historic dispute between the two social systems should be resolved not through war but through peaceful competition in the economic sphere.

The advantages of businesslike co-operation with the Soviet state were realized by realistically-minded politicians and public figures in the capitalist countries. For instance, Parley Christensen, a prominent American public figure, declared upon his return from Soviet Russia in late May 1923: "The United States should recognize the present Russian government without delay. The Russians are exceedingly friendly to America. Their country would afford a wonderfully valuable market for our finished products. Unless recognition is given to the Soviet government soon, the attitude of our government will force the Russians to manufacture the very things they would otherwise purchase from this country."

The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence accorded with the vital interests of working people. It indicated a real way out of the bloodbath of the First World War and called for the establishment of a just peace and for mutually advantageous co-operation. Peaceful coexistence would ensure the most favourable conditions for improving the life of the toiling masses as well as for developing the worldwide liberation movement.

In framing the policy of peaceful coexistence Lenin proceeded from the long-term prospect of cap-

italist and socialist countries existing together in the world. Because of the uneven economic and political development of the capitalist countries socialist revolutions cannot occur simultaneously all over the world. They take place in different countries at different times, as the conditions for such a change ripen in these countries.

The Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence remains valid throughout the period of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. The Communists championed this concept when Soviet Russia was the only socialist country in the world, and they are guided by it today, when a world socialist system has emerged and is developing successfully.

The possibility of peaceful coexistence could not be realized to the full immediately after the emergence of the first working people's state. In those years the correlation of world forces was such that the aggressive designs of the imperialist forces could not be firmly checked. Soon after the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia Lenin wrote: "...the fight for peace is on. It will be an uphill fight. International imperialism is mobilizing all its forces against us." ¹

True enough, the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries replied with open armed intervention to the socialist state's call for peace. Through hard struggles the Soviet people succeeded in safeguarding their gains and winning a respite.

But in the 1920s and 1930s too, the forces of peace were still unable to prevent a new world war. The correlation of forces in the world changed radically only after the crushing of Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism, after the formation and strengthening of the world socialist system. The necessary conditions finally arose for restructuring in-

¹ Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 26, p. 316.

ternational relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence. Of tremendous importance in this respect was the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism under the pressure of the national liberation movement in the 'fifties, 'sixties and 'seventies. Taken as a whole, the young national states became a force favouring universal peace.

In 1956 the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communists analyzed the international situation and the far-reaching changes that had taken place in the world and arrived at the conclusion that world war was no longer inevitable and that the conditions had arisen for preventing it. Experience has borne out this conclusion. For more than thirty years mankind has been saved from world war.

The further strengthening of all progressive and peace-loving forces enabled the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1971 to conclude that the necessary conditions had arisen for a turn from cold war to peaceful coexistence, from tension fraught with a global conflagration to detente and mutually advantageous co-operation.

What exactly is peaceful coexistence?

At the basis of it lie ideas and propositions put forward by Lenin and elaborated on in our time. It will be recalled that Communists regard peaceful coexistence as the basic principle of relations between socialist and capitalist countries, both large and small.

The peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems above all rules out war as a means of settling disputed issues and rules out military and other pressure on other states with a view to changing their social system. It is based on respect for sovereignty, on recognition of the equality and territorial integrity of every state, whatever its size, and on non-interference in the internal affairs of

other countries. It presupposes the right of every people to choose independently the social and political system of their own country. Peaceful coexistence also signifies the many-sided mutually advantageous co-operation of states in the economic, scientific and cultural fields, which conduces to mutual understanding, trust and friendship among peoples.

To be sure, the principles of peaceful coexistence do not automatically come into operation. The Soviet Union has from its very inception been striving for them to become a norm of international relations. In 1977 it became the first state in the world to include them in its Constitution. They are formulated in Article 28, which prohibits war propaganda. Thereby the force of state law was given to the Soviet Union's adherence to the cause of peace and co-operation among nations.

The principles of peaceful coexistence are also championed by other socialist states and by the democratic forces in all countries. Even ruling circles in imperialist countries which realistically assess the changed correlation of world forces in favour of socialism are compelled to reckon with the demand for peaceful coexistence.

The early seventies saw the conclusion of a series of treaties between socialist countries and the Federal Republic of Germany based on recognition of the borders in Europe established after the Second World War. A big contribution to the cause of peace was made by the constructive dialogue between the USSR and the FRG in May 1978 during the visit to West Germany of Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Important shifts took place also in Soviet-American relations. The two sides reached mutual understanding as regards the need to promote peace-

ful, equal relations between them. The participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held in Helsinki in August 1975, worked out a code of principles of inter-state relations that fully accord with the demands of peaceful coexistence.

On the whole, the early 1970s were marked by a turn from the tense military-political confrontation of states possessing vast military potentials to the relaxation of tension that has come to be called detente.

Detente signifies a refashioning of the system of international relations on the basis of mutually advantageous co-operation. "Detente means, first and foremost, ending the cold war and going over to normal, stable relations among states," Leonid Brezhnev noted. "It means a willingness to settle differences and disputes not by force, not by threats and sabre-rattling, but by peaceful means, at a conference table. It means trust among nations and the willingness to take each other's legitimate interests into consideration."

The purpose of detente is to curb the threat of a new world war, to create an international atmosphere in which the peoples may face the future without fear. The Soviet Union bases its relations with the capitalist countries on precisely this understanding of detente.

But there still are highly influential forces among the ruling circles of the imperialist powers who come out against detente and peaceful coexistence. They are representatives of the military-industrial complex and reactionary politicians who base their strategy on the arms race, on adventurist schemes. They claim that the socialist countries regard peaceful coexistence as a tactical move aimed at dulling the vigilance of the West, and gaining time and in-

creasing military might in order to establish world supremacy, and they peddle scares in the West about the notorious "Soviet menace". For instance, Joseph Shiibel, director of the so-called Russian research programme of Georgetown University, has declared that the Soviet Union's strategic aim in the seventies is to attain military superiority and to use its power to change the social system in other countries. Recent articles in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* overwhelm their readers with lies about the Soviet air force being about to deliver a devastating air strike against the United States.

Reporting to Congress on his department's budget for the fiscal year of 1978, the then Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld declared that the United States had never ruled out that it would be the first to use nuclear weapons. Moreover, the heads of the military organization of the North-Atlantic Treaty are openly working out first-strike strategy and tactics. Such politicians are little concerned with the destinies of mankind. Their utterances are an added reminder to the peoples about the need resolutely to rebuff the bellicose groupings of imperialist states for the sake of saving peace and life on earth.

Stoking up international tension has always been, and remains, a source of super-profits to its advocates. The U.S. bill for financing neutron bomb manufacture alone holds out the promise of 10,400 million dollars to the war monopolies. The rate of profit from arms manufacture often reaches 100 and even 200 per cent. It is the prospect of such a rip-off that induces the war industry monopolists to plunge into any gamble, even if it threatens their own lives or the lives of their near and dear ones. Scaring the peoples with the myth of a "Soviet menace", they clamour for ever greater military allo-

cations and ever new mass destruction weapons, and militarize all areas of social life.

Here are some historical facts by way of illustration. In the 1950s the warmongers in the United States raised a howl about America's alleged lagging behind the Soviet Union in the number of its bombers, and they won big military programmes. Shortly after that, however, official circles admitted that their estimates of the number of Soviet bombers were 3 to 4 times too high.

A new howl was raised in the early 1960s, this time over a "missile gap", providing an impetus to the adoption of vast missile building programmes. And once again before long Washington admitted that the Soviet "missile threat" had been overestimated, this time by a factor of 30. Yet in both instances the programmes were carried out.

And now too, despite the acknowledgement by the leaders of the Western countries of an approximate parity in strength between the USSR and the United States, the aggressive circles have started a new round of the arms race. Feverish preparations are being made in the U.S. for the manufacture of the neutron bomb, the cruise missile (a new means of delivering nuclear weapons) and the Trident nuclear-powered submarine capable of carrying intercontinental ballistic missiles. The American press reports that work is under way on laser weapons and that development of an enhanced-blast-effect nuclear bomb which the military call "RRR" is on the agenda.

What for, may one ask? After all, the already existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons are estimated to exceed 15 to 25 times the amount required to kill every living thing on earth! Is it not obvious that the safest world is a world without weapons? The Soviet Union, accordingly, proposes that securi-

ty be achieved not through the arms race but through curbing it, through disarmament. International security and material preparation for war are incompatible. Just as one cannot sit on bayonets, so one cannot feel safe sitting on nuclear warheads.

But the monopolies manufacturing weapons are not in the least worried about this. The names of these death merchants are well known. More than one-half of all the armaments business is concentrated in the hands of about thirty companies: America's Lockheed, General Electric, General Dynamics, Boeing and McDonnell Douglas, West Germany's Messerschmitt Bolkow-Blohm, Siemens and Telefunken, Britain's Vickers, France's Dassault, and others.

The war monopolies are also reaping colossal profits from the sale of arms to other countries. The United States is in the lead in this business, exporting weapons to more than 70 countries. In 1975 alone such exports amounted to 9,300 million dollars. American weapons are delivered above all to the Middle East and, in the first place, to Israel, which testifies to the aims of U.S. policy in that part of the world.

The heads of anti-popular dictatorial regimes such as Pinochet in Chile or Park Chung Hee in South Korea, and the leaders of countries at war with national liberation movements, like the Republic of South Africa and Israel, constitute another group of opponents of detente and disarmament. Cashing in on international tension, these regimes subserviently make their countries available to aggressive blocs as strategic bridgeheads and their armies available as imperialism's police force in the respective regions of the world. What these mini-hawks fear most is the consolidation of genuine detente, which would mean the discontinuation of vital financial

and military aid from the West and with this the inevitable demise of their regimes.

Peaceful coexistence is also opposed by ultra-Left adventurers who claim to be true revolutionaries. Advocating "revolutionary intervention" and the "export of revolution", they regard war as the principal means of overthrowing capitalism and establishing socialism, and peaceful coexistence as hindering the world revolutionary process and benefiting only the imperialists.

Although the reactionaries in the capitalist countries and the ultra-revolutionaries approach the problem of peaceful coexistence with different yardsticks, in many respects their positions coincide. They all declare war to be an instrument of revolution and claim that the benefits of detente accrue only to certain (entirely different, it is true) political forces.

Why do socialist revolutions really take place? Is it true that external factors play the main part?

Marxism-Leninism says, and historical experience confirms this, that a constant class struggle is being waged in bourgeois society between the working people and the big bourgeoisie, between the exploited and the exploiters. At a definite stage, when the contradictions between labour and capital grow extremely acute, the class struggle reaches its highest degree of intensity when the working people cannot tolerate their oppressed, downtrodden state any longer and decide radically to change the existing state of things. That is when a socialist revolution is accomplished. It stands to reason that, for the revolution to win, the masses must be well organized and able to act concertedly and purposefully. Then the working people, who make up the overwhelming majority of the population in any country, can resolve the social conflict with the ex-

exploiters in their favour without any military interference from abroad.

In his work *The Collapse of the Second International* Vladimir Lenin, the greatest strategist of revolution, pointed out that "a revolution cannot be 'made', that revolutions *develop* from objectively (i.e., independently of the will of parties and classes) mature crises and turns in history".¹ Speaking at the First All-Russia Congress of the Navy, Lenin said revolution was the result of "an outburst of mass indignation".² Hence, Communists regard the socialist revolution as the legitimate outcome of the development of the internal contradictions of capitalism which are innate in it as a system.

In late 1917 and early 1918 Lenin conducted sharp polemics against "Left Communists" who advocated a revolutionary war with Germany in the belief that such a war would give rise to a proletarian revolution in all the belligerent capitalist countries. "Such a 'theory'," he replied to them, "would be completely at variance with Marxism, for Marxism has always been opposed to 'pushing' revolutions, which develop with the growing acuteness of the class antagonisms that engender revolutions."³

Present-day Marxist-Leninists also reject the theory of "pushing" revolution. Not a single people, not a single Communist Party in the capitalist and developing countries associates success in the class struggle and in the struggle for liberation with the export of revolution. Accordingly, in their programme documents the Communists see the establishment of an alliance of the working class with the other progressive forces as essential to a victorious revolution. When the

¹ Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 240.

² Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 26, p. 345.

³ Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 27, pp. 71-72.

strength of this alliance, comprising the overwhelming majority of the nation, exceeds the strength of the forces of counter-revolution, the establishment of people's power will have been assured.

Indeed, in the West itself certain highly influential politicians refute the accusation that the Soviet Union interferes in the internal affairs of other states. Indicative in this respect is the reply President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing of France gave to a question put by an *Observer* correspondent during an interview in the summer of 1976. Asked whether he believed that the Soviet Union wanted to seize Western Europe by force or through economic penetration, the President said he believed neither in the former, nor in the latter. Speaking on British TV on January 26, 1977, West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt admitted that the Soviet Union continued to pursue a policy of detente and said that there was therefore no point in constantly provoking it.

The philosophy of the working class as a philosophy of humanism not only rejects the export of revolution, but regards its peaceful development as more desirable. "The working class would, of course, prefer to take power *peacefully*..."¹ Lenin pointed out. History shows that revolution takes a peaceful course when the broad masses of the people achieve decisive preponderance in strength over the forces of reaction. Therefore, preferring a peaceful course of revolution the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries concentrate on rallying all the democratic forces on an anti-monopoly basis.

Thus, Communists do not regard war as a means of revolution. Moreover, they oppose unjust wars and interference in the internal affairs of other countries. The real relationship between war, peace and

¹ Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 4, p. 276.

revolution is in their view like this: not revolution through war but the exclusion of war from the life of mankind, the establishment of peace through revolution.

Along with outspoken opponents of detente there are quite a few people in the West who acknowledge it in words but in reality invest it with a meaning which negates the very basis of detente. I have in mind the exponents of the concept of "two superpowers". Take the opinion of James Chace, a member of the board of the American journal *Foreign Affairs*, expressed in *Newsday* at the end of May 1976. He wrote that, from America's viewpoint, detente should become an all-embracing doctrine pursuing strategic, economic and political (or, if you like, ideological) aims. The American journalist declares that detente is in a sense a deliberate tying in of American and Soviet interests on a global scale, excluding the sphere of influence of each superpower from this design.

This interpretation of detente is indicative of the claim made by certain circles in the West to the right to interfere in the affairs of countries which these circles include in their "sphere of influence", to be free to suppress liberation and revolutionary movements in these countries. They would thereby like to check the further development of the revolutionary process. As we may see, some Western ideologists accuse the Soviet Union of exporting revolution, while others seek to legitimize the imperialist powers' right to export counter-revolution. Such is the political meaning of the proposed partition of the world into "spheres of influence of the superpowers".

It must be clear to any sober-minded person that the imposition of the will of a foreign power on any people is nothing but trampling upon their sov-

ereignty, and this is incompatible with the principles of peaceful coexistence.

After this general discussion of the views of the supporters and opponents of peaceful coexistence, some practical questions may be asked:

Firstly, how does detente benefit mankind as a whole and each nation in particular?

Secondly, how does peaceful coexistence influence the development of social and national progress?

Thirdly, what is the essence of Soviet proposals for strengthening detente?

Fourthly and finally, what is the effect of detente on the battle of ideas?

IN THE INTERESTS OF MANKIND

It may seem that the question of whose interests peaceful coexistence serves should not arise at all. Yet imperialist propaganda contends that peaceful coexistence is beneficial only to the Soviet Union. Let us consider some of the most ingenious arguments employed to prove this point.

Detente, say bourgeois ideologists, is a tactical manoeuvre by the Soviet Union to gain time for the purpose of exporting revolution.

Peaceful coexistence, they lament, means the recognition in international law of the socialist countries that emerged as a result of revolutions in a number of European countries after the Second World War, and recognition of the inviolability of the postwar frontiers on the continent. Small wonder that this does not suit the imperialists, whose freedom of action in their attempts to restore bourgeois systems of society in these countries is thus considerably restricted.

Furthermore, those who back international tension oppose the Soviet-American agreements, includ-

ing the agreement on the prevention of nuclear war. According to these people, economic co-operation between states with opposing social systems benefits only the socialist countries because it provides them with access to Western technology.

As far as the first argument is concerned, its untenability was proved in the previous chapter. As for the second argument, it should be borne in mind that in the forties a number of nations in Central and South-Eastern Europe chose the socialist path of development and have successfully advanced along it ever since. They have a legitimate right to do this. Interference in their internal affairs in any form is a violation of the principles of peaceful co-existence and one fraught with dire consequences for the destinies of the world.

Now for the import of the Soviet-American agreements. Explaining it, Leonid Brezhnev said at the 25th Congress of the CPSU: "... the turn for the better in our relations with the *United States of America*, the biggest power in the capitalist world, has, of course, been decisive in reducing the danger of another world war and in consolidating peace. This has beyond question contributed to the improvement of the international climate in general, and that of Europe in particular."

The adherents of international tension would like, as in the cold war years, to keep the world on the brink of nuclear war. Preparation for war against the socialist countries has been central to the post-war strategy of aggressive imperialist circles. But a new war with modern means of warfare, including weapons of mass destruction, threatens the very existence of the civilization. Only peace, only the prevention of nuclear catastrophe can safeguard mankind and everything that has been created by the thought and labour of many generations. There-

fore peaceful coexistence is, in present conditions, the only reasonable alternative to nuclear war. All the peoples of our planet have a vital interest in it.

Furthermore, peaceful coexistence is in the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie too, if only for the simple reason that it does not in itself put an end to the latter's rule. Under peaceful coexistence the capitalists retain possession of the land, factories and other means of production, as well as of state power with the machinery of oppression of working people which has been perfected over centuries: an excellently equipped army, a well-trained police, an effective apparatus for legal prosecution, safe prisons, and so on. The mass information and propaganda media also continue to serve them faithfully.

This is, however, my personal opinion and I may be mistaken. But let us examine the last of the above-mentioned arguments of the opponents of peaceful coexistence, namely, that the socialist countries are much more interested in economic ties with the capitalist countries than vice versa.

Older readers probably remember that for a long time the imperialist states imposed an economic blockade on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, hoping it would cause economic chaos in these countries and wreck their plans for building a new society.

But these were vain hopes. The new system proved to be tremendously viable and dynamic. Despite the appalling devastation caused by two world wars, the Soviet Union's share of world industrial production rose from 3 per cent in 1917 to 20 per cent in 1978. The Soviet Union has become one of the world's leading industrial powers. Without any foreign aid, through its own efforts, the Soviet Union has excelled in the most advanced branches of

science and technology, such as the harnessing of nuclear energy, outer space exploration or the use of lasers. It built the world's first experimental-commercial atomic power station, launched the world's first artificial earth satellite and carried out the world's first manned space flight.

It is obvious from these and many other achievements of the Soviet Union in science, technology and production that it can ensure its economic advance and supply the requirements of its economy and the population by using its internal resources only.

But the ever greater complexity of modern production, science and technology makes it impossible for even industrialized countries to develop every branch of the economy equally effectively. So all countries, socialist and capitalist alike, are interested in the international division of labour. Such a division of labour between the Soviet Union and a number of industrially developed capitalist countries has been deepening in recent years. Soviet organizations have concluded co-operation agreements with firms in Austria, Great Britain, Italy, the United States, France, West Germany and Japan on the construction of more than 60 large industrial projects in the USSR. A number of large industrial enterprises are being built in Western countries with Soviet participation.

Take the example of the rapidly growing economic, scientific and technical ties between the USSR and France. Both countries are co-operating fruitfully in the field of the peaceful utilization of atomic energy and the exploration of outer space. In accordance with the Soviet-French declaration signed in 1977 special attention is being paid to co-operation in the fields of nuclear energy production, outer space exploration, computer technology,

environmental protection, agriculture, medicine and fundamental research in astronomy, the physical and chemical foundations of life, seismology, catalysis, solid state mechanics, quantum electronics and non-linear optics.

Yet another example is the Soviet Union's co-operation with Finland, where at least 120,000 people have received work thanks to Soviet industrial orders. Filling Soviet orders benefits both working people and the business circles of that country.

So much for the allegation that economic co-operation between the socialist and capitalist countries is a one-way street.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated its desire to promote equitable and mutually advantageous economic relations with Western countries. Regrettably, influential circles in a number of these countries are violating the provisions of the Helsinki Conference's Final Act on the promotion of trade and economic contacts. This is particularly true of the United States, where many discriminatory restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union are still in force.

Seeking to retain its superprofits, the U.S. military-industrial complex is busy placing all sorts of barriers in the way of detente and trying to heighten international tension. Will the reactionary forces succeed in reversing detente, or will mankind continue along the road of peace and progress? A crucial role in deciding this question will be played by the struggle of the peoples for world peace.

THE PEACE PROGRAMME

The 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in 1971, drew up an exten-

sive foreign-policy platform which embraced the Peace Programme. This document indicated concrete forms of the struggle of all progressive forces against the threat of war, for a stable peace on earth and for the relaxation of international tension.

The first point of the Programme envisaged elimination of the hotbeds of war in South-East Asia and the Middle East, an immediate rebuff to any acts of aggression and renunciation of the use of force or the threat of its use in settling disputed issues.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries supported in every way the valiant struggle of the peoples of Indochina against imperialist invaders. For example, the Vietnamese people received from them credits, assistance in restoring destroyed branches of the economy and in developing new ones, as well as in training specialists, and also weapons, equipment and various material. Expressing appreciation of this assistance, Nguyen Thi Binh, head of the delegation of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam told the 25th Congress of the CPSU: "We always remember that the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries have greatly contributed to the victory recently scored by the Vietnamese people."

A settlement in the Middle East has now become more difficult to achieve than ever. As before, the Soviet Union favours an all-embracing accord with the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization; the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; the realization of the inalienable right of the Palestinian Arab people to the establishment of their own state; the ensuring of the right of all direct parties to the conflict—both the Arab states neighbouring on Israel and the State of Is-

rael—to independent existence and security; the termination of the war between these Arab states and Israel.

The second point of the Peace Programme called for bringing about collective security in Europe. At the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe socialist and capitalist states achieved a whole number of accords in which they summed up the political outcome of the Second World War and recognized the territorial and political realities as they took shape after the war. There is every ground for saying that the successes in implementing the principles of peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist states and in easing international tension are particularly tangible in Europe.

The third and fourth points of the Programme provided for curbing the arms race. On the basis of a Soviet draft an international Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction was worked out and signed and entered into force. It was, in fact, the first measure of real disarmament in the history of international relations.

The Soviet Union, which has taken many initiatives in the sphere of disarmament, was ready to come to terms with the Western countries on the most radical disarmament measures, up to and including universal and complete disarmament. In so far as the governments of the capitalist countries did not agree to this, the USSR proposed that the disarmament problem be solved gradually, by stages. Thus, the USSR and the United States have concluded a number of treaties and agreements in the field of strategic arms limitation and an Agreement

on the Prevention of Nuclear War, which have somewhat reduced the nuclear war danger.

The fifth point of the Peace Programme set forward the task of fully implementing the United Nations' decision on abolition of the remaining colonial regimes. The early seventies witnessed the beginning of the final stage of the collapse of the colonial system. The USSR rendered support to the fighting patriots of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands, Mozambique and Angola, who won national statehood, and to a number of other peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. It thus made one more weighty contribution to the struggle of the peoples against the remaining colonial regimes and for the preservation of the revolutionary conquests of the young states.

The sixth point concerned the promotion of extensive, equal and mutually advantageous international co-operation in the economic, scientific, technical, cultural and other fields. The Soviet Communists viewed such co-operation not only in the context of immediate benefits to the partners, but also as a means of strengthening mutual trust and friendship among peoples. How is this point being implemented?

Between 1970 and 1976 the Soviet Union's trade with developed capitalist countries rose 3.5 times and with developing countries, 2.2 times.

Scientific and technical co-operation is also progressing. Here are two examples. The gigantic Oskol electrometallurgical plant is now under construction, with the assistance of the West German firms "Salzgitter", "Fried. Krupp", "Kort-Stahl", "Siemens", "Demag" and others, near Belgorod, where in 1943 one of the fiercest battles of the Second World War was fought. The whole world knows the successful

Soviet-American space experiment conducted aboard the Soyuz and Apollo orbital ships. In 1971-75 the volume of the Soviet Union's cultural exchanges with foreign countries increased by roughly 50 per cent. This is the Peace Programme in action.

The Peace Programme has largely been fulfilled. There has hardly been any other period in the history of international relations when so much was done on behalf of peace within such a short space of time.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU discussed and adopted a *programme of further struggle for peace and international co-operation, for the freedom and independence of the peoples*, an organic continuation and development of the Peace Programme, testifying to the stability and continuity of the Soviet foreign policy of peace.

The central task contained in the programme of further struggle for peace is that of strengthening the cohesion and co-operation of the socialist countries and increasing their contribution to the fight for peace.

Several decades ago the forces of socialism could only defer the war being provoked by the imperialists. Today they are strong enough to prevent the unleashing of a new war and in my opinion detente has come about precisely by the efforts of the socialist countries and not by the good works of bourgeois governments. Peaceful coexistence and detente are in large measure the result of the ever more effective co-operation of the socialist countries in all fields to speed the attainment of their common lofty aims and to make the world a better place to live in.

A special place in the programme of further struggle for peace is assigned to work for detente in the military field, which presupposes the limitation and

then discontinuation of the race in armaments of all types, the reduction of armaments, armed forces and military budgets, and ultimately, disarmament. All this is to lead to a gradual slowing down of military preparations. Above all, the Soviet Union is working to secure nuclear detente, that is, to eliminate the material basis for nuclear war. "The energy of the atom for peaceful purposes exclusively!—this is the appeal of the Soviet state in the year of its sixtieth anniversary to the governments and peoples of the world," Leonid Brezhnev declared at the celebrations of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution.

Possibilities for nuclear detente exist, as is evinced by a whole number of international agreements (sponsored, again, by the Soviet Union), such as the Moscow Treaty of 1963 banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, in force since 1970 (more than a hundred states have signed this treaty), the 1972 treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons on the sea-bed, on the ocean floor and in the subsoil, the Soviet-American accords on strategic arms limitation, and the Soviet-American treaty limiting underground nuclear weapon tests, concluded in 1974. Thus, important measures have already been taken to curb the arms race and lessen the nuclear war danger.

Striving to secure further progress in solving the disarmament problem, the Soviet Union made constructive new proposals. In 1975 at the 30th session of the UN General Assembly it raised the question of banning the tests and manufacture of new types of mass destruction weapons, for new types and systems of such weapons would certainly be of even

greater destructive power. The Soviet draft is now being examined in Geneva.

At the 31st General Assembly session in 1976 the Soviet Union submitted the draft of a World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force in International Relations. The proposal on the conclusion of such a treaty was approved by an overwhelming majority of votes.

At the same session, the Soviet Union submitted a memorandum on ending the arms race and on disarmament, which embraces all the main problems of disarmament now facing the peoples and outlines proposals for their speediest solution. On the Soviet Union's initiative decision was taken to convene a special General Assembly session on questions of disarmament. Held in New York in May and June 1978, this session was a stepping stone to the World Disarmament Conference, the broadest and most representative forum of the peoples, also to be convened on the initiative of the Soviet Union.

In September 1977, at the 32nd General Assembly session, the Soviet Union moved a draft Resolution on Averting the Danger of Nuclear War, outlining concrete measures for accomplishing the main task of the entire process of detente—lessening and then removing the danger of nuclear war. In this connection on November 2, 1977, Leonid Brezhnev proposed “a radical step: *that agreement be reached on a simultaneous halt in the production of nuclear weapons by all states*. This would apply to all such weapons—whether atomic, hydrogen or neutron bombs or projectiles. At the same time, the nuclear powers could undertake to make a start on the gradual reduction of existing stockpiles of such weapons, and move towards their complete, total destruction”. Moreover, in his reply to questions put by a *Pravda* correspondent in the closing days of 1977, Brezhnev addressed a proposal to the Western

powers mutually to renounce production of the neutron bomb, a weapon opposed by millions upon millions of people all over the world.

In order to reduce the danger of nuclear war, the Soviet Communists propose that all nuclear weapon tests be banned for a definite period and that a moratorium be imposed on nuclear blasts for peaceful purposes. What is at issue, therefore, is to complete the process of banning nuclear weapon tests by prohibiting underground tests. Thus a barrier would be put in the way of the development of new types of nuclear weapons and the perfection of existing ones.

In the face of these and many other Soviet initiatives for peace, aggressive circles in the Western countries continue to whip up the arms race. That is why the programme of further struggle for peace and international co-operation contains a proposal for reducing the military expenditure of states. The Soviet Union is acting strictly in the spirit of this proposal. Its defence expenditure was 17,900 million roubles in 1973; 17,600 million roubles in 1974; 17,400 million roubles in 1975 and 1976; 17,200 million roubles in 1977 and 1978.

And what is the imperialist powers' reply? Regrettably, it is ever greater military expenditure. The pace in this policy, which may be fatal to mankind, is set by aggressive circles in the United States. In the fiscal year 1978 the U.S. military budget reached an all-time high of 118,000 million dollars. In fiscal 1977 the arms bill of Great Britain jumped to £ 6,329 million as against £ 5,632 million in 1976, and in West Germany it rose by nearly 1,500 million marks to total 32,800 million marks.

Within the framework of the programme of further struggle new efforts will be undertaken to re-

vive the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, which began in Vienna in October 1973. The lessening of the war danger on the continent directly depends on the success of these talks. The Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia have already made many proposals based on renunciation of unilateral advantages. But the attitude of the Western participants in the talks has made real progress impossible. The NATO countries continue their armed forces build-up there, while the Pentagon and NATO chiefs are planning to deploy the neutron bomb in Western Europe.

This "neutron umbrella" has been likened to the lid of a coffin—certainly an unpleasant comparison but a correct one, considering all the possible consequences of a nuclear conflict for the densely populated continent of Europe. For that matter, the adoption of neutron weapons would be fraught with disastrous consequences for the peoples of our whole planet.

The disarmament problem has yet another important aspect, the social economic aspect. Today military expenditure in the world is running at an annual rate of 400,000 million dollars. It has been estimated that 22,000 million dollars, that is to say, roughly as much as the United States spends every year on strategic armaments, would suffice to wipe out hunger, illiteracy and the most dangerous diseases everywhere in the world. Seeking to turn to productive purposes the resources allocated for armaments, the Soviet Union submitted a proposal to the United Nations Organization for reducing the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and using part of the resources thus saved for giving assistance to developing countries.

But the military-industrial complex would have none of that. Along with repeating shop-worn allegations of a "Communist threat", they also try to scare working people in the Western countries with the prospect of greater unemployment which they say would result from a reduction of military expenditure and the termination of the arms race. Experience, however, testifies to the opposite. Before the intensification of the arms race there was practically no unemployment in West Germany; by the end of 1977 the number of unemployed there had topped the one-million mark. The stepping up of the arms race has seen the growth of unemployment in Britain and the United States.

But the militarists ignore the fact that investment in peaceful projects such as housing construction, health protection, education or social security ensure much greater employment than arms manufacture. A students' research team in Michigan headed by prominent economists has estimated that every thousand million dollars spent on the arms race creates 35,000 jobs, while the same investment in civilian branches of the economy creates 150,000 jobs for unskilled workers, or 100,000 jobs for teachers, or 76,000 jobs in public utilities construction, or 50,000 jobs in the building of schools.

Furthermore, the arms race is one of the main causes of the growth of inflation, and the rise in the cost of consumer goods and services and in taxes on the population, as well as of crisis phenomena in the public health protection and education systems. Ending the arms race would boost economic co-operation between socialist and capitalist countries. After all, 1,000 million dollars' worth of exports from the U.S. means jobs for more than 60,000 American workers. As has already been mentioned, trade with the Soviet Union ensures work to at least

120,000 Finns. And how many French and West German workers are employed in fulfilling Soviet orders!

One of the most important international tasks mentioned by the 25th Congress of the Soviet Communists in the programme of further struggle for peace is complete elimination of all vestiges of the system of colonial oppression, of infringements of the equality and independence of the peoples, and all seats of colonialism and racism.

It would be premature to sum up the progress made in implementing this programme. I simply wished to acquaint the reader with the constructive steps the Soviet Union has been taking to carry it out.

I would like to single out two characteristic features of the Soviet Union's struggle for peace. The first is that with the growth of its economic might it is advancing ever more far-reaching and comprehensive proposals for peace, proceeding from separate initiatives to whole peace programmes. The second is that the growth of its economic potential enables it to achieve ever more impressive results in the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

"SOCIALISM AND PEACE ARE INDISSOLUBLE"

In fighting for peaceful coexistence the Soviet Union is motivated by its supreme aim of building a classless communist society, a society where the full social equality of all its members is affirmed and all-round development of the individual is ensured, a society where highly effective social production will make possible the realization of the great principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Soviet people understand that the advance to communism is a complex creative process embracing all principal areas of the life of society. It is natural for a socialist country advancing towards its supreme aim to be interested not in the arms race but in investing as much as possible in peaceful constructive endeavours such as construction of power stations and factories, of schools and health resorts, of dwelling houses and stadiums, and the development of ever more efficient machines and mechanisms to make the life and labour of people easier.

The Soviet Union is particularly actively opposed to unjust wars, to wars of conquest. Themselves victims of aggression on the part of fascist Germany during the Second World War, the Soviet people paid a very high price for victory in that war, during which more than 20 million Soviet citizens lost their lives, thousands of cities and villages were reduced to ruins, about 25 million people were rendered homeless and 31,850 industrial enterprises were destroyed. Among the latter were plants which prior to the war turned out about 60 per cent of the country's steel. Much greater devastation would be caused by a Third World War.

Guided by their supreme aim, the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries are pursuing a foreign policy whose principal objective is to ensure the most favourable conditions for building a new society. "We make no secret of the fact," said Leonid Brezhnev, "that we see detente as the way to create more favourable conditions for peaceful socialist and communist construction. This only confirms that socialism and peace are indissoluble."

It will be recalled that the 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU made raising the material and cul-

tural standards of the people the principal task of the state five-year plans for economic and social development. The whole development of science, technology and production is subordinated to this goal. Let me describe some of the results of the implementation of the course charted by Soviet Communists and show what targets have been set for 1980.

One must first note that the successes attained by the Soviet people in the economic, cultural and other fields have made it possible to go over from planning the growth of wellbeing by separate indices to framing comprehensive social development programmes embracing the whole gamut of standard-of-living parameters. Precisely such programmes were drawn up at the last two Congresses of the CPSU. They provide for a rise in the remuneration of labour of factory and office workers and peasants, in payments and benefits to the population from the social consumption funds (greater pensions, student allowances, additional benefits to mothers, further growth of the network of pre-school and medical establishments, health resorts, holiday homes and so on) and the building of more houses and educational establishments.

From 1971 to 1975 per capita real incomes rose by 24 per cent. The taxes on the wages of some categories of workers were abolished or reduced. The incomes of roughly 40 million people rose thanks to increases in pensions, allowances and student grants. The retail prices of many goods were even somewhat lower than in the previous five years. Incidentally, the prices of staple foods have not changed for several decades. Electricity and gas charges and public transport fares have remained stable for more than a quarter of a century. Rent has not been raised since 1928, although wages have risen several times over and the quality of

housing and amenities has greatly improved. In the same period from 1971 to 1975 Soviet people purchased 36 per cent more goods than in the previous five-year period. The volume of everyday services they received increased by 60 per cent. Fifty-six million people had their housing conditions improved, mainly due to the construction of new houses. The transition to universal secondary education was completed, in the main.

From 1976 to 1980 per capita real incomes are expected to rise by 20-22 per cent. There will be a 28-30 per cent increase in payments and benefits to the population from social consumption funds, resulting in greater pensions to factory and office workers and peasants, the creation of new categories of pensioners, and the provision of new benefits to mothers. At least another 50 million people will receive new or better housing. Creches and nurseries for 2,500,000-2,800,000 children and general educational schools for at least 7 million pupils will be built. Owing to the growth in incomes and the production of consumer goods the population will be able to buy 27-29 per cent more consumer goods than in the 1971-75 period.

These are some of the facts about the current and planned growth of the standard of living of Soviet people. To realize such ambitious social development programmes peace is indispensable. Peace is also needed to prevent the destruction of the material and cultural values created by the labour of the people. To achieve these lofty aims the socialist countries are pooling their efforts in the fight for peace and progress, in promoting mutually advantageous co-operation in all fields.

In their fight for peaceful coexistence the Soviet Union and its socialist allies are mindful of the interests of all peoples who are for freedom and prog-

ress. It goes without saying that interference in the internal affairs of other countries is ruled out. Communists proceed from the principle that peaceful coexistence makes it difficult for the imperialists to "export counter-revolution".

This policy of the Soviet Union has received wide international recognition. For instance, Fidel Castro, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba and Chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba, declared at the 25th Congress of the CPSU: "Adhering firmly to Lenin's ideas, the USSR has turned into the most reliable bulwark of world peace and at the same time become a reliable shield protecting small and weak nations against imperialism's aggressive aspirations.

"Had it not been for the Soviet Union, in conditions of a shortage of raw material resources and of an energy crisis the capitalist powers would have unhesitatingly launched a partition of the world. Had it not been for the Soviet Union, it would have been impossible even to conceive of the measure of independence now enjoyed by small states, the successful struggle of the peoples for the return of their natural riches under their control, or the fact that their voice now resounds impressively in the concert of nations." This role of the Soviet Union was also noted by Kayson Phomvihane, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos, Prime Minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos, who pointed to the growing might of the Soviet Union "restraining the aggressive designs of imperialism and serving as a powerful stimulus for the development of the national-liberation movement and the international workers' movement."

Peaceful coexistence enables the socialist countries to give greater support to the struggle of the developing countries for economic independence. By January 1, 1977, 555 industrial establishments and other projects had been completed with Soviet technical assistance in Algeria, India, Iraq, Nepal, Ethiopia, Sri Lanka and other developing countries. These enterprises, vital to the young states, include machine building plants, oil refineries, chemical works and building materials industry enterprises.

Unlike the capitalist countries, the socialist countries do not hedge about the provision of credits, the drawing up of projects, the delivery of machines and equipment, and other assistance with any discriminatory conditions. They do not demand the right of ownership of, or control over, enterprises built with their assistance. Their credits are granted, as a rule, for a term of 12-15 years at a low rate of interest, and are usually repaid through the delivery of traditional export goods or the produce of the enterprises they have helped to build, or in the national currency.

It should be noted that for a long time the socialist countries were assisting the developing countries in conditions of the "cold war". Now that detente has set in, the possibilities for co-operation between the two groups of countries increase times over.

Thus, peace, peaceful coexistence and detente are allies of socialism, of the peoples striving for independence, for a happy life.

DETENTE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

The working people in the capitalist world see from their own experience that the turn from cold war to detente improves the domestic conditions in

their struggle for social progress. It is one thing, for instance, when they have to uphold their class interests under fascism, which deprives them of elementary democratic rights, in conditions of dictatorial rule which makes it impossible to act legally, and it is quite another thing when they can openly struggle for their demands. They are obviously interested in the most favourable political, social and cultural conditions for their struggle.

There is a close interconnection between the domestic and foreign policy of any state. The policy of the states where militarists hold sway aggravates the danger of war, strengthens the positions of domestic reaction and, consequently, renders difficult the class struggle of the working people. Conversely, the consolidation of international detente, the limitation of the arms race, the extension of mutually advantageous co-operation between states with different social systems, the conclusion of treaties and agreements designed to prevent a thermodynamic world war improve not only the international climate, but also the conditions for the working-class movement in the capitalist world.

Detente reduces the possibilities of exercising fascist dictatorial methods of rule, of using repressive measures against Communist parties, trade unions and other democratic organizations, of forcibly suppressing the progressive democratic forces.

On the other hand, detente increases the possibilities for the legal activity of the revolutionary parties of the working class, which can openly explain their policy, views and slogans to the people and popularize the ideas of scientific communism in the press. This, in turn, aids the growth of the political awareness of the working people and their understanding of the tasks set by Communists at different stages of the liberation movement. In con-

ditions of detente it is much easier for the parties of the working class to organize working people's actions in defence of their rights.

It should also be borne in mind that the cold war and the attendant arms race lead to a worsening of the condition of the masses of the people, for the arms industry is financed from the state budget, of which the principal source of revenue are taxes on the working people.

Furthermore, detente makes it increasingly difficult for the reactionaries in the capitalist countries to conceal from the people the numerous peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union and to intimidate people with the myth of a "Soviet threat" which they use as the pretext for stepping up military budgets. The working people see ever more clearly that the arms race is to the detriment of the public health service, education, communal services and municipal housing construction.

Moreover detente means broader international contacts, the more active international exchange of factual information enabling working people in the capitalist world to gain a better knowledge of the life of the people in the socialist countries and of their experience in building a new society, to compare the condition of people under socialism and under capitalism, and to make a more informed choice of a particular social system.

Communists in the capitalist countries have on many occasions stressed the beneficial influence of the improvement of the international situation on the development of the working-class movement. As William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, has noted, detente not only affects inter-state relations and improves the international climate, but directly facilitates the develop-

ment of the working-class and democratic movement. Communists in other countries take the same view. For instance, the document unanimously adopted by the Conference of the 29 Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, held in Berlin in June 1976, noted that "the policy of peaceful coexistence, active co-operation between states irrespective of their social systems, and international detente... create optimum conditions for the development of the struggle of the working class and all democratic forces as well as for the implementation of the inalienable right of each and every people freely to choose and follow its own course of development, for the struggle against the rule of the monopolies, and for socialism".

It is highly indicative that in trying to adapt itself to changed international conditions the imperialist bourgeoisie presents itself as a champion of peace and hence as the spokesman of the interests of the people in the crucial matter of war and peace. It thus tries to give the impression that there is a community of interests between it and the working people. It implies that common interests must induce the working people to give up the struggle for their class interests. In this way the imperialist bourgeoisie seeks to weaken the cohesion of the anti-monopoly forces.

But, while supporting the steps of bourgeois governments to further detente, the Communists in the capitalist countries explain to the masses that even in conditions of detente the proletariat and all working people still continue to be exploited by the capitalists and deprived of a say in deciding major political, social and economic questions. And this means that the struggle of the working people to improve and then radically change their life must go on.

The working class in the capitalist states and its organized vanguard, the Communist parties, have now become an important factor in the struggle to prevent war and ensure peace. The workers, together with the broad masses of other working people, are waging an ever more intensive struggle against the dominance of monopolies, for their vital interests and democratic rights.

At the same time, among the broad strata of working people in the capitalist world, there is a growing realization of the danger with which the aggressive policy of the imperialist circles is fraught. A movement of protest is growing against the increase of military budgets and intensification of the arms race, which are accompanied by increased taxes and the rising cost of consumer goods and services, by runaway inflation, the unleashing of reaction and the persecution of progressive forces.¹ That is why in the course of the struggle for their rights the workers, alongside economic demands, are ever more frequently advancing demands of a social and political character, specifically those aimed at securing a reduction of military expenditure, prohibition of the neutron bomb and other mass destruction weapons, and an end to the arms race, and are insisting ever more vigorously on a policy of peace and co-operation with the socialist countries.

Recent years have seen a considerable intensification of the anti-imperialist struggle and, in the first place, powerful struggles of the proletariat. The number of participants in strikes and mass economic and political actions of working people in the

¹ It has been estimated that the sum spent on building a modern aircraft-carrier would pay for building 90,000 flats. A combat exercise by a tank battalion costs as much as 28 kindergartens.

industrially developed capitalist countries rose from 189 million in 1966-70 to roughly 233 million in 1971-75. Moreover, the biggest class battles have been fought in the citadels of imperialism.

Such a high pitch of the class struggle and its markedly anti-imperialist tone testify to the striving of the masses of the people to improve their position and to strengthen universal peace. At the same time they are the result of the process of detente, which facilitates the growth of the democratic working-class movement.

Detente is also in the interests of the peoples of the "third world". It is incompatible with any interference in the internal affairs of other states, with export of counter-revolution. It is essential to preserving the national sovereignty won by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America after centuries of heroic struggle.

The successes of the peoples in promoting detente prevent the imperialists from drawing young states into aggressive military blocs and thus tying them to the imperialists' policy of aggression and compelling them to waste on armaments the vast resources so sorely needed for economic progress. Isn't it paradoxical, for instance, that the African countries are spending on military needs a portion of the national product 3.5 times greater than that spent on health protection and 50 per cent greater than that spent on education. To this should be added that the more educated part of the population of these countries is diverted from the productive civilian sphere into the military one. In 1973-74 the armies of 35 African states totalled nearly one million men—this at a time when the social and economic progress of these states is hindered by an acute shortage of skilled personnel. Considering that the goal of genuine economic independence

and social progress is being ever more energetically brought to the fore in the developing countries, the importance of detente for them can hardly be overestimated.

A further point. The policy of peaceful coexistence favours the development of economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties between countries with different levels of social and economic development. This, on the one hand, enables the socialist countries to increase the assistance they give to young states and, on the other, induces these states to opt for a path of development that leads to quicker social progress.

So it may be said that the consolidation of detente is important for the economic and social progress of the "third world" countries, for raising the standard of living of their peoples.

THE BATTLE OF IDEAS

The relaxation of international tension has an impact also on the ideological struggle between the systems. The question may arise: does not peaceful coexistence presuppose an end to the struggle between the bourgeois and socialist ideologies? Should not detente be extended to the sphere of ideology?

The answer is "No", because both cold war and peaceful coexistence reflect the policy of relations between states with opposing social systems. The battle of ideas is one of the forms of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist and capitalist countries. Each social class, as is known, has its own interests, which are reflected in its ideology. The interests of the working class and all other working people are expressed by communist ideology, and those of the exploiters by bourgeois ideology. The former postu-

lates the inevitability of the transition to communism on a world scale, and indicates the ways and methods of this transition. The latter seeks to prove the permanence of bourgeois society and seeks ways of preserving it. One certainly cannot expect the Communists to reconcile themselves with the exploitation of man by man and to become supporters of bourgeois society, and the monopolists to become champions of genuine democracy, of socialism. So struggle between communist and bourgeois ideologists is inevitable and in it there can be no compromises.

Peaceful coexistence as a principle governing inter-state relations cannot alter the vital interests and aims of the working class and of the bourgeoisie, and this means that the basis remains for struggle between opposing ideas. To renounce this struggle would mean renouncing defence of one's class interests and, of course, neither the bourgeoisie nor the working people are prepared to do this. The underlying consideration is that the battle of ideas is one conducted by peaceful means, without bloodshed. That is why Communists hold that ideological struggle does not contradict the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Moreover, detente in the period of peaceful coexistence enhances the importance of the battle of ideas. It will be recalled that during the cold war imperialist circles counted chiefly on military threats, on economic blockade and political blackmail of the socialist countries, hoping thereby to wrest "concessions" from them. Far from retreating, however, the socialist world grew considerably stronger and its international influence sharply increased. Without putting an end to the struggle between the two systems, peaceful coexistence presupposes the ending of their military and political con-

frontation. Hence the increased importance of other forms of struggle between capitalism and socialism, such as peaceful economic competition (including competition in improving the life of the working people), the clash of ideas and other peaceful forms of struggle.

Detente is accompanied by a broadening of contacts in different fields between socialist and capitalist countries. In such conditions the ideological struggle is not limited to theoretical disputes and propaganda, but is waged over the whole range of ideas, concepts and spiritual and moral values of the two opposing ways of life. As a result of this, working people in the capitalist and socialist countries are better able to compare different views and convictions.

In this struggle the Communist parties endeavour to acquaint the broadest possible masses of people with their principles, views and ideas, the ideas of peace, friendship and fraternity among nations, of social progress and national emancipation. In this struggle Marxist-Leninist ideology relies on the practical achievements of the socialist countries, on their genuinely humanist domestic and foreign policy, on the real rights and freedoms that the new system guarantees to people of labour.

On the other hand, it becomes ever more difficult for bourgeois ideologists to conceal the truth about socialism from the people and to camouflage the vices of capitalist society. Having realized that there is no stopping the confident advance of socialism by force or threats, the imperialist bourgeoisie intensifies the ideological struggle, giving to it the character of psychological warfare, using everything to be found in the armoury of bourgeois propaganda. Alongside such old cold war methods as down-right slander or myths about a "Soviet threat", prop-

agenda intended for the socialist countries resorts to faultfinding instead of healthy criticism, the advocacy of moral and sexual licentiousness, pessimism and scepticism, money-grubbing, and attempts to discredit the economic and political system of socialism.

Regarding ideological struggle as an honest exchange of ideas and views over the broadest possible range of questions, the socialist countries hold that this struggle must be waged in forms and methods which exclude interference in the internal affairs of other countries, without violating their laws and customs and increasing tension in relations between them—in other words, in forms and methods which further and do not undermine peaceful coexistence.

Many bourgeois politicians and ideologists call for the peaceful coexistence of ideas. The real purpose behind such calls is the unimpeded propagation of bourgeois ideas in the socialist countries in the guise of exchanging spiritual, cultural and moral values. Moreover, the socialist countries are expected to renounce the propagation of their own ideas. This attitude runs counter to peaceful coexistence since it virtually rejects the principle of the equality of either side. Clearly, the socialist countries cannot agree to this.

Nevertheless, bourgeois propagandists have been at pains to use cultural contacts for their own purposes. The socialist countries, they claim, are impeding personal exchanges through tourist, cultural and scientific channels and this contradicts the spirit of Helsinki.

Let us look at the facts. From 1972 to 1976 the number of foreign tourists visiting the USSR and of Soviet tourists visiting other countries increased by more than 50 per cent. In 1976 upwards of 4 mil-

lion foreigners visited the USSR and 3 million Soviet citizens made trips abroad. The USSR receives guests from 155 countries, and 130 countries are visited by Soviet citizens. The share of the capitalist countries in the total number of foreign visitors to the USSR rose from 25 per cent in 1956 to 40 per cent in 1976. In turn, the share of trips by Soviet tourists to capitalist countries, which in 1956 constituted 19 per cent of all Soviet tourist visits abroad, rose to approximately 40 per cent in 1975-76. All told, the European socialist countries account for nearly one third of world tourism. These facts alone show the real worth of the allegations of a "closed society" and of obstacles to personal exchanges.

In fact, it is the capitalist countries which obstruct such exchanges. On numerous occasions U.S. official bodies have refused entry visas to Soviet trade union delegations invited by American trade unions. There have even been instances of refusing to allow representatives of Soviet trade unions to attend international forums held in the U.S.

Nor does the position as regards cultural exchanges do any credit to capitalism. It is common knowledge that more translations from foreign languages are published in the Soviet Union than in any other country. For example, the publication of books by English and French authors in the Soviet Union exceeds six to seven times the publication of books by Soviet authors in Britain and France. The number of Soviet films shown in the West is dozens of times and the number of Soviet television programmes three times less than that of Western films and television programmes shown in the USSR.

Here are some facts on cultural exchange between the USSR and the United States. According to the *Daily World* since 1917 the USSR has published translations of 6,305 books by American authors,

while only 500 works by pre-revolutionary Russian and Soviet authors have been printed in the United States. In the 1972-73 season Soviet theatres performed 40 American plays, while four plays by pre-revolutionary Russian authors and none by Soviet authors were presented on the American stage. In 1974-75 American film distributing firms showed not a single Soviet film.

Who, then, has dropped a curtain between the socialist and capitalist countries?

The Soviet Union has invariably advocated the exchange of ideas and of culture, the extension of a two-way flow of information. Soviet Communists regard this as an important means of promoting rapprochement and friendship among the peoples of different countries, of helping them to come to know each other better, which incidentally contributes to easing international tension. But the USSR keeps its doors closed to publications which slander Soviet people and contain propaganda of war, violence, racism and hatred of man. It opposes the misuse of contacts in this sphere to the detriment of the cause of peace. And it keeps the door even more tightly closed to agents of secret services trying to penetrate into our country for the purposes of espionage or subversion.

Ideological struggle has nothing in common with the campaigns of lies, slander and misinformation which continue to be organized by anti-communists. One of the causes of the recent intensification of the latter's activity is that detente is gradually deflating the "Communist threat" myth. An above-board ideological struggle clearly does not suit the imperialist circles, because the wide acquaintance of people in the capitalist countries with communist ideas and their implementation in the socialist countries leads to a reappraisal of the values of the Western way

of life. That is what the anti-communists fear. That is why they turn things upside-down, counter truth with slander and theoretical discussion with ideological subversion, and in the ideological struggle resort to the methods of psychological warfare, all for the sake of bellicose anti-communist aims and designs.

AFTERWORD

As may be seen from the text of Article 28 of the USSR Constitution adopted by the Extraordinary 7th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on October 7, 1977, after nationwide discussion and approval, implementation of the principle of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems has been elevated to the rank of the Fundamental Law of the Land of the Soviets, which has forever proclaimed peace as the supreme principle of foreign policy consonant with the aspirations of its own people and of the working people of all other countries.

For over sixty years now the Soviet Union has been waging a consistent hard struggle against the threat of war and for a lasting peace. Over the recent period this policy has been crowned with particularly impressive successes and we in the Soviet Union are convinced that more successes are to come. An earnest of this is the growing might of the country of the October Socialist Revolution, its ever greater unity with the fraternal socialist countries, the Soviet people's unanimous approval of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the vigorous support of this policy by all the peaceloving and progressive forces of our beautiful planet Earth.

Leonid Brezhnev was voicing the opinion of all Soviet people when he said at the meeting to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution: "We actively and persistently call for the contest between socialism and capitalism to be decided not on the field of battle, not on munitions conveyors, but in the sphere of peaceful work. We want the frontiers dividing the two worlds to be crossed not by flight paths of missiles with nuclear warheads, but by threads of broad and diversified cooperation for the good of all mankind. By steadfastly pursuing this policy, we are giving practical expression to one of the main rallying cries of the October Revolution and carrying out one of Lenin's most important behests: Peace to the peoples!"

Виктор Николаевич Сапрыков
МИРНОЕ СОСУЩЕСТВОВАНИЕ: КОМУ ОНО ВЫГОДНО
на английском языке
Цена 20 коп.

Victor Saprykov
Peaceful Coexistence

Dear Reader,

Please fill out the following questionnaire and send it to:
Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
13/5 Podkolokolny Pereulok
109028 Moscow, USSR

1. What is your opinion of the subject matter of this publication?

2. ... its language and style?

3. ... its design and general appearance?

4. How long have you been familiar with Novosti publications? Which of them interested you most?

5. Where did you obtain this publication?

6. What would you like to know about life in the Soviet Union?

Your occupation

Age

Sex

Country of residence

Name (optional)

Address (optional)

Should you prefer to give your comments in a separate letter, please mention the exact title of the publication you are writing about.

Thank you for your kind cooperation
Novosti Publishers

Виктор Николаевич Сапрыков
МИРНОЕ СОСУЩЕСТВОВАНИЕ: КОМУ ОНО ВЫГОДНО
на английском языке

